

**Accountability System Development for 2013 and Beyond
Accountability Policy Advisory Committee (ATAC) and
Accountability Technical Advisory Committee (ATAC)**

Other Features of the Accountability System

THREE-YEAR-AVERAGE

Background and Legislative Requirements

Combining performance results for two or three years and calculating performance rates based on the aggregated data is an approach that has been used for evaluation of performance of very small campuses and districts for state accountability, federal adequate yearly progress (AYP), and the performance based monitoring analysis system (PBMAS). State accountability special analysis procedures used three-year-average performance as one variable but the final rating was based on professional judgment. Texas Education Code (TEC) §39.054(c) now requires that ratings be based on current year performance or “performance as averaged over the current school year and the preceding two years.”

Texas Education Code, Chapter 39, Subchapter C. Accreditation
§39.054. Methods and Standards for Evaluating Performance

- (c) In evaluating school district and campus performance on the student achievement indicators adopted under Sections 39.053(c)(1) and (2) [assessment results and dropout rates], the commissioner shall define acceptable performance as meeting the state standard determined by the commissioner under Section 39.053(e) for the current school year based on:
 - (1) student performance in the current school year; or
 - (2) student performance as averaged over the current school year and the preceding two school years.

Special Analysis for Small Districts and Campuses

The three-year-average will be used for small districts and campuses that do not meet minimum size criteria using current year data – fewer than ten for All Students or fewer than 20 for the economically disadvantaged student group in Index 3. Specific indicators will be recalculated using numerators and denominators that are aggregated across three years of data. No minimum size criteria will be applied to the three-year-average indicators. If the indicator calculation changes, such as the change in the Index 3 indicator from a performance rate in 2013 to a weighted performance rate in 2014, indicators from previous years will be recalculated before the data are aggregated across the three years. Indicators from previous years will not be recalculated in an effort to make the data more comparable across the three years. For example, the 2013 Index 1 indicator will not be recalculated due to the inclusion of TAKS results in 2013 only. The table on the following page shows the indicators to which the small numbers analysis will be applied, and whether prior year indicators will be recalculated. Two years of data will be used in 2013 for those STAAR indicators that do not have three years of data.

Option for All Districts and Campuses

A second potential use of three-year-average performance is as an optional way for all districts and campuses to meet state accountability targets. Since state accountability targets are set at the index

level, three-year-average performance would apply to the index score on each of the four indexes. The three-year-average would be calculated by summing the index scores for the current year and two previous years for each index, and dividing by three. Although it is mathematically possible to perform this calculation, during the first few years of the new accountability system, the result would not be meaningful because performance results on the indexes are not comparable from one year to the next, especially from 2013 to 2014. After the initial transition to the new accountability system, districts and campuses that are large enough to meet minimum size criteria for the indicators will seldom have three-year-average index scores that are better than current year index scores. The three-year-average provision would add an unnecessary level of complexity to the accountability system.

Use of Three-Year Average for Small Numbers Analysis

	2013 Ratings	2014 Ratings and Beyond
Index 1: STAAR Percent Met Level II Satisfactory Performance Standard All Students	2-year average	3-year average
Index 2: Percent Met Transition Table Growth Standard All Students	NA in 2013	3-year average
Percent Met Transition Table Growth Standard for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity, English Language Learners, Special Education	not used	not used
Index 3: Economically Disadvantaged Weighted Performance Rate for Reading (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Economically Disadvantaged Weighted Performance Rate for Mathematics (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Economically Disadvantaged Weighted Performance Rate for Writing (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Economically Disadvantaged Weighted Performance Rate for Science (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Economically Disadvantaged Weighted Performance Rate for Social Studies (2012 and 2013 indicators recalculated for 3-year-average in 2014 and 2015)	2-year average	3-year average
Race/Ethnicity Student Groups Weighted Performance Rate for Reading, Mathematics, Writing, Science, Social Studies	not used	not used
Index 4: STAAR Percent Met Level III Advanced Performance Standard All Students	NA in 2013	3-year average
STAAR Percent Met Level III Advanced Performance Standard for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity	not used	not used
Four-Year Graduation Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Four-Year Graduation Rate for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity, English Language Learner, Special Education	not used	not used
Five-Year Graduation Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Five-Year Graduation Rate for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity, English Language Learner, Special Education	not used	not used
Annual Dropout Rate All Students	3-year average	3-year average
Annual Dropout Rate for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity, English Language Learner, Special Education	not used	not used
RHSP/AHSP Rate All Students	not used	not used
RHSP/AHSP Rate for Student Groups: Race/Ethnicity	not used	not used

REQUIRED IMPROVEMENT

Background and Legislative Requirements

Required improvement was a feature of former state accountability systems. The PBMAS system uses required improvement for some indicators. The safe harbor provision in AYP is also a required improvement calculation. Under required improvement provisions, a district or campus that does not meet the accountability target for an indicator receives the higher rating if they show enough improvement from the prior year to meet the accountability target in a given number of years. Separate indicator systems typically have a required improvement provision because failure to meet one accountability target can result in a lower rating. Required improvement calculations were initially based on cross-sectional improvement (aggregate improvement at the district or campus level) and predate use of student growth measures that track progress of individual students.

House Bill 3 (81st Texas Legislature, 2009) amended the wording of the required improvement provision.

Texas Education Code, Chapter 39, Subchapter C. Accreditation
§39.053. Performance Indicators: Student Achievement

- (e) Performance on the student achievement indicators under Subsections (1) and (2) [assessment results and dropout rates] shall be compared to state standards and required improvement. The state standard shall be established by the commissioner. Required improvement is the progress necessary for the campus or district to meet state standards and, for the student achievement indicator under Subsection (c)(1), for its students to meet each of the performance standards as determined under Section 39.0241.

Required Improvement in the Performance Index Framework

Required improvement is defined in statute as it would be implemented for a separate indicators accountability system in which campuses and districts must meet the accountability target for each indicator. The intent of the provision is to prevent a campus or district that fails to meet every target from receiving an unacceptable rating if performance is improving on the indicators that do not meet the target. It is possible to calculate required improvement at the index level, but the original intent of the provision is already accomplished in the construction of the index.

In addition, during the first few years of the new accountability system, calculating change in index score from the previous year would not be meaningful because performance results on the indexes are not comparable from one year to the next, especially through 2014. At the index level, Index 3 and Index 4 will change significantly in 2014 with the inclusion of Level III advanced performance. In addition, transition from TAKS to STAAR EOC as the assessment requirement for graduation will take place with the class of 2015. The transition will be reflected in the test results included in the accountability assessment indicators, which by statute must include TAKS results.

	2012 Results	2013 Ratings	2014 Ratings
Grade 9 Results	Class of 2015 EOC	Class of 2016 EOC	Class of 2017 EOC
Grade 10 Results	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 EOC	Class of 2016 EOC
Grade 11 Results	Class of 2013 TAKS	Class of 2014 TAKS	Class of 2015 EOC

The statute specifically references STAAR student performance standards in the required improvement definition. Beginning in 2014, the student progress measure in Index 2 will be used to evaluate improvement in STAAR performance. An additional required improvement feature would increase the complexity of the accountability ratings criteria and introduce confusion about the difference between student progress and improvement for STAAR results. Required improvement was used to achieve an acceptable rating by fewer than two percent of districts (16 districts) and campuses (134 campuses) under the separate indicators accountability system in 2011.

2013 Ratings: Required improvement not implemented.

2014 Ratings: Required improvement implemented as Index 2.

2015 and Beyond Ratings: Implementation of Required Improvement at the performance index level evaluated by the ATAC and APAC.

85% EXCEPTIONS PROVISION

Texas Education Code §39.054(d) allows but does not require the commissioner to implement a proportional or exceptions provision so that an acceptable rating can be assigned if the campus or district meets accountability targets on 85 percent of the assessment and dropout/graduation measures on which it is evaluated. This provision is not applicable to a performance index framework because accountability targets are not set for each measure.